To: CN=Lenny Grossman/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Cc: []
From: CN=Gary Nurkin/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Tue 5/15/2012 2:10:31 PM
Subject:

Lenny:

You and I appear to be talking on different wave lengths and at cross-purposes. What I was saying is that the chemical make-up of the aggregate from AES differs from the chemical make-up of coal ash that was previously studied by EPA. Tables 2 and 5 of the University of PR study of the AES aggregate indicates the chemical constituents comprising both the AES fly ash and bottom ash. In coal ash, some of the constituents of concern, based on leaching, were Sb, As, Ba, B, Cd, Cr, Pb, Mo, Se and Tl. (2009 EPA Report) The only constituent appearing in Tables 2 and 5 of the UPR study that was found in this leachate is Ba.

As you know, LEAF does not purport to provide what is the chemical make-up of the AES aggregate but instead purports to provide what is the make-up or constituents of the leachate coming from the aggregate. Thus, waiting for the LEAF test, at best, only suggests what is leaching out from the AES aggregate not what makes-up the aggregate.

The whole point of my remark to you is that the chemical make-up of the AES aggregate is not consistent with the composition of the coal ash residues that were studied by EPA